REMARKS

Claim 4 has been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-7 remain pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure that is not enabling. The Examiner has indicated that to be enabling the details about what would specifically constitute a "packet that would be sent if the connectionless port were not in use," would have to be included in the specification.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. The application recites on page 39, lines 15-18, "In one embodiment, if the required HMAC is not present in a packet, the administration console replies with the Internet Control Message Protocol (ICMP) packet that would be sent if the port were not in use." The Office Action acknowledges that from applicants' disclosure "it is clear that the invention would use a known sub-code when generating an ICMP message…" A person of skill in the art would know that in an embodiment in which the reply is an ICMP message "the packet that would be sent if the port were not in use" is an ICMP packet of Type 3, Code 3, "Port Unreachable". In fact, Type 3, Code 3, "Port Unreachable" appears to be the only type/code listed in the ICMP specification, a copy of which is attached to the Rule 132 Declaration of William J. James filed concurrently herewith, that mentions the word "port". As such, claim 1 is believed to be enabled and allowable.

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 4 has been amended to read "the packet that would be generated by the computer," which has antecedent basis in claim 1. As such, claim 4 is believed to be sufficiently definite.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Atkinson, RFC 1826, "IP Authentication Header," 1995 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,619,645 to

Montenegro et al.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 1, Montenegro describes

sending an ICMP message *internally* within a system to indicate that the system is isolated (does

not have network access), so that there are no futile attempts to retry failed network operations

(column 2, lines 62-67 and column 4, line 65 to column 5, line 45). In contrast, claim 1 recites

"configuring the *external* device to reply to any packet in which the required valid authorization

information is not present with the packet that would be generated by the computer in response

to an attempt to communicate via the connectionless port at a time when no device was

connected to the connectionless port." (Emphasis added.) Montenegro does not describe

configuring an external device to reply, as the system is isolated. As such, claim 1 is believed to

be allowable.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons

described above.

Like claim 1, claims 6 and 7 recite "configuring the external device to reply to any packet

in which the required valid authorization information is not present with the packet that would be

generated by the computer in response to an attempt to communicate via the connectionless port

at a time when no device was connected to the connectionless port." As such, claims 6 and 7 are

believed to be allowable.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Clover Huang

Clover Huang
Registration No. 55,285
V 408-973-2594
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT AND YI, LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014

INTERVIEW SUMMARY UNDER 37 CFR §1.133 AND MPEP §713.04

A telephonic interview in the above-referenced case was conducted on May 18, 2004 between the Examiner and the Applicants' undersigned representatives William James and Clover Huang. The Final Office Action mailed on April 6, 2004 was discussed. Specifically, the enablement rejection of claims 1-7 and the rejection of claim 1 in light of Montenegro et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,619,645) were discussed with the intent to place the claims in better condition for allowance or appeal. Applicants argued the portion of the disclosure identified by the Examiner as not enabling is sufficient to enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to practice the invention. The Examiner indicated he may consult a supervisory examiner with a computer networks background to reconsider the enablement and indefiniteness rejections in light of applicants' arguments. Although no agreement was reached with respect to the claims, the Examiner seemed to agree that Montenegro does not describe all elements claim 1 (see the remarks below), such that claim 1 may ultimately be found to be allowable over Montenegro if the enablement rejection were overcome. The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his time and attention in this case.